

Central Valley Flood System Conservation Framework and Strategy

Proposal Solicitation Package

SEPTEMBER 12, 2012

Deleted: DRAFT 6-26-

California Department of Water Resources

FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and
Statewide Resources Office (FESSRO)

Deleted: June 20129

g

g

g

g

g

----- Page Break -----

Deleted: <sp>

Contents

Introduction	3
Program Background	3
Geographic Scope	4
Per-Project Funding Cap and Cost-Share Considerations	4
Submittal of Concept Proposals.....	4
Evaluation of Concept Proposals	5
Successful Applicants: Next Steps.....	5
PSP Solicitation Process and Schedule.....	6
Animal Species and Natural Communities Targeted in this PSP	7
Table 1. Target Species and Habitats	8
Application Form for Concept Proposals	10
Evaluation Criteria for Concept Proposals	12
Application Form for Full Proposals.....	17
Section 1: General Project Information	17
Section 2: Specific Project Information – Advance Mitigation Element	19
Section 3: Specific Project Information – Advance Conservation Element	21
Section 4: Attachments	24
Evaluation Criteria for Full Proposals.....	25
Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations	30

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Introduction

This Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) describes the process for government entities, nonprofit organizations, private mitigation bankers, and other entities capable of providing the services described in this PSP (known hereafter as Applicants) to receive funding for planning and implementation of projects in support of the Central Valley Flood System Conservation Framework (Attachment 2 to the public draft 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan [CVFPP]) and the Conservation Strategy currently under development. Up to \$25 million is available upon competitive selection for the present funding cycle.

This PSP is being issued under the Final Central Valley Flood System Conservation Framework and Strategy Funding Guidelines (Guidelines) approved on February 23, 2012, and provides specificity on the scope and priority of activities that will be funded for the present funding cycle. The Guidelines are posted on the Department of Water Resources (DWR) web site http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/fessro/docs/flood4_guidelines_final.pdf, and are included for reference as Appendix A.

In accordance with the PSP Solicitation Process and Schedule ([page 6](#)), DWR is currently requesting concept proposals only. Successful Applicants will then be invited to submit full proposals for funding consideration.

Deleted: pages 5-

Program Background

DWR's FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office (FESSRO) has bond funding from Proposition 1E, the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond of 2006, to spend on activities and projects in support of the Central Valley Flood System Conservation Framework (Attachment 2 to the public draft 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan [CVFPP]) and Conservation Strategy (under development).

In accordance with the Guidelines, which are the basis for this PSP and with its current funding authorization, DWR's intent for the \$25 million available for the present funding cycle is to fund activities that incorporate environmental stewardship and sustainability principles into State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) flood management activities. This includes, but is not limited to the following activities:

- ecosystem conservation and agricultural stewardship activities that will provide exclusive mitigation for the unavoidable impacts resulting from the future evaluation, repair, reconstruction, or replacement of SPFC levees, weirs, bypasses, and facilities in advance of those unavoidable impacts (Advance Mitigation Projects); and/or
- design, permitting, construction, and [establishment-phase](#) maintenance activities for habitat enhancement projects that meet multi-species habitat conservation goals, with the express intent of providing advance implementation of conservation actions, either in accordance with a Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) that is being implemented or is under development, or in support of a future NCCP for systemwide flood system improvements (Advance Conservation Projects).

Activities funded under this PSP will be focused on providing mitigation for a number of targeted species and natural vegetation communities that are expected to be impacted by future

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

implementation of the CVFPP and improvements or modifications to SPFC facilities. These targeted species and habitats include, but are not limited to, those listed in Table 1 (see page 8).

Geographic Scope

In accordance with the Guidelines, funding can be applied to projects and activities that fall within the Systemwide Planning Area (see Figure 1, on page 20 of the Guidelines [Appendix A]), but may also be used for projects in areas outside of the Systemwide Planning Area as long as there is a benefit to the SPFC; for example, projects that establish mitigation credits for future activities related to SPFC construction, evaluation, and repair, or projects that assist in reducing mitigation requirements of such activities.

Per-Project Funding Cap and Cost-Share Considerations

DWR's share of the project cost will be limited to no more than \$5 million per project, and cannot be used to fund a conservation endowment.

Although there is no explicit cost-share requirement for allocation of this funding, in general, projects that demonstrate monetary or in-kind contributions from non-State partnering organizations are expected to score higher in the concept proposal evaluations than those that have no contributions, all else being equal.

DWR will pay a maximum of 20% of total project cost (up to \$1 million) for pre-construction engineering costs (e.g., planning, permitting, and/or design) associated with construction of a project, but reserves the right to modify this amount as deemed necessary.

In addition, DWR will limit disbursement of funding for indirect and overhead costs to 10% of total project cost, but reserves the right to allow reimbursement in accordance with federal guidelines (OMB Circular A-87) if determined to be reasonable. Please refer to the Guidelines (Appendix A) for a more complete discussion of eligible project costs.

Deleted: 5

Submittal of Concept Proposals

Applicants must submit concept proposals electronically to lchew@water.ca.gov.

The electronic version of the concept proposal questions is available in Adobe .pdf format at <http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/fessro/floodway/conservation/> (Adobe Reader 9 can be downloaded at www.adobe.com/go/reader).

Concept proposals must be received electronically by 4:00 p.m. on the 20th calendar day following announcement of the open solicitation period. For this solicitation, concept proposals are due by 4:00 p.m. on October 2, 2012.

Deleted: , both

Deleted: and in hard copy,

Deleted: Lori Clamurro Chew, Staff
Environmental Scientist¶
Department of Water Resources¶
FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and
Statewide Resources Office (FESSRO)¶
901 P Street, Room 411A¶
Sacramento, CA 95814¶
¶
lchew@water.ca.gov¶
¶

Deleted: will be

Deleted: once this PSP has been finalized.

Deleted: , and the hard copy of the conceptual
proposal postmarked, on or before

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Submit one application for each concept proposal. A “master” application containing several projects at more than one location is not eligible for funding. However, applicants may submit more than one application.

Evaluation of Concept Proposals

Once the application period has closed for submittal of the concept proposals, DWR personnel will go through each Application Form and make sure that all of the questions in the form have been thoroughly answered.

For those concept proposals that pass the first level of screening for Application Form completion, DWR will convene a multi-agency team of reviewers, [the Project Evaluation Team](#), which will evaluate the concept proposals based on the information provided in the Application Form and any attachments. [The Project Evaluation Team will consist of representatives from DWR, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service, among others.](#) More information on the scoring of the concept proposals is described in Section 3 of this PSP.

Successful Applicants: Next Steps

For those concept proposals that are deemed most responsive to the needs of this solicitation, Applicants will be asked to prepare and submit a full proposal, including attachments substantiating the responses in the concept proposal, on DWR’s Bond Management System (BMS) website. More information on how and what to submit to BMS, the deadline for submittal of full applications, and the review and selection process will be included in the letters that will be sent out to successful concept proposal Applicants requesting submission of a full proposal.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

PSP Solicitation Process and Schedule

The process and schedule for the competitive solicitation of project proposals will be posted and updated regularly at <http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/fessro/floodway/conservation/>.

Deleted: expected

As of the date of this PSP, the expected process and schedule are as follows:

DATE	ACTIVITY
<u>June 26, 2012</u>	DWR <u>posted</u> Draft PSP on main and FESSRO websites for 30-day public review and comment period, <u>which closed July 27, 2012.</u>
<u>September 12, 2012</u>	DWR finalizes PSP and posts to websites; concept proposals due within 20 calendar days of Final PSP posting.
<u>October 2, 2012</u>	Concept proposals due to DWR. DWR will distribute concept proposals to a multi-agency <u>Project Evaluation Team</u> for review; evaluations will lead to an initial recommendation for those concept proposals that should be requested to submit a full proposals on DWR's Bond Management System (BMS) website
<u>November 1, 2012*</u>	DWR will invite successful Applicants to submit a full proposal. Letters of invitation will include instructions on how to post the full proposal to BMS. Applicants will have <u>60</u> calendar days to complete the full proposal on BMS.
<u>December 31, 2012*</u>	<u>Full proposals due on BMS. DWR will distribute the full proposals to the multi-agency team for review.</u>
<u>February 14, 2013*</u>	<u>DWR will reconvene the Project Evaluation Team to review and score the full proposals.</u>
<u>February 20, 2013*</u>	<u>The Project Evaluation Team's initial funding recommendations will be considered by the Interagency Flood Management Collaborative (IAC) for approval.</u>
<u>March 15, 2013*</u>	DWR will post its initial funding recommendations to its website, kicking off a 30-day public review and comment period.
<u>April 16, 2013*</u>	DWR will finalize its funding recommendations and begin pursuing the appropriate agreements with successful Applicants.

Deleted: Early July

Deleted: posts

Deleted: Early August

Deleted: Late August

Deleted: team

Deleted: Early September

Deleted: 30

Deleted: October

Deleted: reconvene

Deleted: to

Deleted: and score the full proposals.

Deleted: Early November 2012

Deleted: Early December 2012

* Go to <http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/fessro/floodway/conservation/> for the most recent version of the expected schedule.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Animal Species and Natural Communities Targeted in this PSP

This PSP is focused on funding activities that will provide mitigation for impacts on species and habitats expected to be adversely impacted by future improvements to SPFC facilities and implementation of the CVFPP. The species and habitats targeted to benefit from activities funded under this PSP include, but are not limited to, those listed in Table 1.

The Department compiled this list from the PEIR lists of species potentially affected by implementation of the CVFPP and other information sources. In compiling this list, the Department considered the listing status of a species (including whether it is identified as sensitive or special-status in local or regional plans), the natural vegetation communities associated with those species for various life stages or needs, and the potential effect of CVFPP implementation on both the species populations and the condition and/or distribution of their associated habitats. The Department also considered whether a species has a high potential of being listed during the next 5-10 years, as well as whether a species has unique conservation needs that are unlikely to be met without focused measures due to restricted range or specialized or landscape level habitat requirements.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Table 1. Target Species and Habitats

Common Name Scientific Name ^a	Status FED/CA ^b	Regional Distribution in SPA ^c	Habitats
Fish			
California Central Valley steelhead DPS <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	T/T	FR, LSJR, LSR, USR	SRA and channel margin/floodplain
Chinook salmon - Central Valley fall-/late-fall-run ESU <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	-/CSC	FR, LSJR, LSR, USR	SRA and channel margin/floodplain
Chinook salmon - Central Valley spring-run ESU <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	T/T	FR, LSR, USR, LSJR,	SRA and channel margin/floodplain
Chinook salmon - Sacramento River winter-run ESU <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	E/E	FR, LSR, USR	SRA and channel margin/floodplain
Green sturgeon - Southern DPS <i>Acipenser medirostris</i>	T/CSC	FR, LSR, USR	Riverine and estuarine
Reptiles			
Giant garter snake <i>Thamnophis gigas</i>	T/T	FR, USR, LSR, LSJR, USJR	Freshwater emergent wetlands, drainage canals, and irrigation ditches, rice fields, and vegetation close to the water
Birds			
Bank swallow <i>Riparia riparia</i>	-/T	FR, USR, LSR, USJR	Banks and cliffs near aquatic habitat (nesting), riparian, grassland, wetland, open water, and cropland
Least Bell's vireo <i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>	E/E	LSR, LSJR	Riparian
Swainson's hawk <i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	-/T/-	FR, USR, LSR, LSJR, USJR	Riparian (nesting), grassland or cropland
Western yellow-billed cuckoo <i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>	C/E	FR, USR, LSR, LSJR, USJR	Riparian
Mammals			
Riparian brush rabbit <i>Sylvilagus bachmani riparius</i>	E/E	LSJR	Riparian
Riparian (= San Joaquin Valley) woodrat <i>Neotoma fuscipes riparia</i>	E/CSC	LSJR	Riparian
Plants			
Delta button-celery <i>Eryngium racemosum</i>	-/E/1B.1	LSJR, USJR	Riparian scrub (vernally mesic clay depressions within)
Slough thistle <i>Cirsium crassicaule</i>	-/-/1B.1	LSJR	Chenopod scrub, riparian scrub, and freshwater emergent marsh within sloughs

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Common Name <i>Scientific Name</i> ^a	Status FED/CA ^b	Regional Distribution in SPA ^c	Habitats
<p>Notes:</p> <p>^a Species potentially requiring focused conservation planning are in bold font.</p> <p>^bStatus FED/CA</p> <p>Federal</p> <p>C = candidate E = listed as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) T = listed as threatened under the federal ESA D = delisted under federal ESA</p> <p>California</p> <p>E = listed as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) T = listed as threatened under the CESA FP = fully protected under the California Fish and Game Code CSC = California species of special concern D = delisted under CESA</p> <p>California Native Plant Society (CNPS)</p> <p>1A = presumed extinct 1B = plants, rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere 2 = fairly endangered in California, but more common elsewhere Extensions: .1 = seriously endangered in California .2 = fairly endangered in California .3 = not very endangered in California</p> <p>Sources:</p> <p>DFG 2011. California Natural Diversity Database. Available: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/</p> <p>Shuford, W.D. and Gardali, T., editors. 2008. California Bird Species of Special Concern: A ranked assessment of species, subspecies, and distinct populations of birds of immediate conservation concern in California. Studies of Western Birds 1. Western Field Ornithologists, Camarillo, California, and California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento.</p> <p>California Interagency Wildlife Task Group 2008, California Wildlife Habitat Relationships personal computer program, version 8.2. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California. Available: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cwhr/</p> <p>CNPS 2012. California Native Plant Society database. Available: http://cnps.site.aplus.net/cgi-bin/inv/inventory.cgi</p>			

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Application Form for Concept Proposals

The electronic version of the Application Form for Concept Proposals (Application Form) is available in .pdf format at <http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/fessro/floodway/conservation/>. Go to the website to download and fill out the form, in accordance with the instructions provided in this section.

The Application Form requires the Applicant to respond to a series of information fields intended to elicit key information about the proposed project and how likely it is that the proposed project will meet the intent of the program. **All responses must fit into the spaces provided in the form. For any responses that indicate the question is Not Applicable (N/A) to the project, include a brief explanation.**

Applicant Information	Provide the information requested in the "Applicant Information" section.
Key Cooperators	Provide names and contact information for any (sub)contractors, advisors, or other technical personnel identified as being necessary for successful completion of the project ("Key Cooperators").
	If more than four Key Cooperators will be identified, check the box at the bottom of the page, and submit their names and contact information as a separate Microsoft Word document. Please limit this document to 2 pages or less.
Project Title	Give your project a short title.
Project Location	List all the counties in which project activities would occur under this proposal.
	List all river systems, and approximate locations (in river miles, if applicable), on which project activities would occur under this proposal.
Description of Parcel(s)	Give the size of the property (in acres) that is the subject of this proposal.
	Describe the current zoning and land use for the property that is the subject of this proposal.
	Check the box if there is a likelihood of zoning or general plan changes for the property in the next year (e.g., a General Plan update is in process, or a zoning code amendment is or will soon be proposed).
	Identify all recorded legal rights on the property, including but not limited to ownership titles, easements, liens or other encumbrances for the property that is the subject of this proposal.
	If the property is in private ownership, check the box if there is a legally binding agreement with the landowner(s) that would allow habitat to be developed on the property.
	Identify all legal holders of water and/or mineral rights for the property, and identify any existing Rights of Way (ROWs) and possible implications for achieving project objectives.
	Check the box to verify that any water rights necessary to implement the project have been obtained, and indicate the basis of those rights.
	Describe any benefits that are expected to accrue to fish, wildlife, or plant species listed as threatened, endangered, of special concern, or

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

	otherwise protected by law, as well as any benefits to sensitive habitats on which these species depend, as a result of this project.
	If the property is located near any protected habitat areas or high-quality habitat types, describe these areas/habitat types and indicate their proximity (in linear miles) to the project site.
Project Description	<p>Describe the project, and clearly indicate which portions are proposed for DWR's bond funding. The project description should include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the goals and objectives of the project;• the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the project objectives (If the project cost is greater than \$5 million, break the project down into phases. Using sequential numbers and/or letters, briefly describe the various phases.);• an explanation of any milestones (e.g., environmental documents, permits) achieved on the project to date, and timeframe for achieving milestones under the current concept proposal;• a brief general description of support for, and any known opposition to, the project; and• a brief explanation of how the project proposes to yield advance mitigation and/or conservation credits, or incidental take authorization, for future SPFC projects and activities in accordance with the Advance Mitigation and Advance Conservation categories described in the Application Form for Full Proposals (starting with page 17 of this PSP). <p>Check the left box at the bottom of the page if additional information describing the project is being submitted as a separate Microsoft Word document. Please limit this document to 2 pages or less.</p> <p>Check the right box at the bottom of the page if location maps, designs, color photographs, or other information describing the project is being submitted <u>as separate files</u>. Please limit this information to a total of 10 pages or less.</p>
Funding Request	Using the Applicant-identified phases from the Project Description in the left column of the funding table, indicate within the cells how much bond money is being requested from DWR (\$) and how much money or in-kind service (\$) is being provided by the Applicant, Key Cooperators, and other partnering entities. (If in-kind services or resources are being provided, estimate their monetary value.)
	If the project that is the subject of the concept proposal is anticipated to have subsequent or future phases, indicate within the table the anticipated needs (activities and deliverables) and estimated costs (\$) of the future phases needed for the project to be fully implemented in the future. Note: If land control activities have already been completed, please enter the information for the current concept proposal under "Subsequent or Future Tasks".
	Use the text box as needed to provide additional information about items in the budget table.
Acknowledgement Checkbox	Check the box at the bottom of the page to indicate that you have read the PSP and understand what will be required of Applicants who respond to the invitation to submit full proposals.

Deleted: separately.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Evaluation Criteria for Concept Proposals

The following information constitutes the basis for how DWR and other entities represented on multi-agency review teams will evaluate the concept proposals submitted for funding consideration, including any attachments. Please be mindful of these criteria when crafting your responses within the Application Form.

As a first level of screening the concept proposals, DWR personnel will go through each Application Form and make sure that all of the questions in the form have a response. **For any responses that indicate the question is Not Applicable (N/A) to the project, a brief explanation must be provided. In addition, the Applicant must have checked the box at the bottom of page 4 of the Application Form, indicating (s)he has read the PSP in its entirety and understands what will be required in response to an invitation from DWR to submit a full proposal.**

For those concept proposals that pass the first level of screening for Application Form completion, DWR and other agency representatives will evaluate the proposals based on the information provided in the Application Form and any attachments. **Please note that the following information provides direction on how reviewers will score concept proposals based primarily on evidence contained within the proposal, but intermediate points may ultimately be assigned based on discussion amongst reviewers and best collective professional determinations.**

The scoring for the concept proposals is broken down into four categories. The maximum number of available points is 100, with weighting and scoring among the four categories as follows:

1. Ecological Benefits (up to 35 points);
2. Technical/Political Feasibility (including completeness of cost estimates and project schedule and readiness as well as consideration of the technical experience of the Applicant and any Key Cooperators) (up to 35 points);
3. Cost Considerations (including reasonableness of costs as well as amount of in-kind or monetary contributions from partnering entities and supporters) (up to 20 points); and
4. Extent of Flood Management Benefits (up to 10 points).

DWR reserves the right to reject any concept proposal that has a zero (0) score in any of these four categories.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Ecological Benefits

Preference will be given to projects that provide greater extent and diversity, higher quality, and improved connectivity of [habitat associated with](#) ecological improvements, while yielding mitigation or conservation credits (or both) for the future evaluation, construction, repair, reconstruction, improvement, or replacement of SPFC levees, weirs, bypasses, and facilities.

Criteria	Range of Possible Points	Scoring Standards	Weighting Factor	Possible Score
<p>Is the project expected to provide substantial habitat improvements in terms of increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> area of historical floodplain subject to flooding? frequency of floodplain activation flows? and/or area of riparian, wetland, or floodplain habitat capable of supporting multiple sensitive species related to the SPFC? <p>Is the project located in a strategic location that improves connectivity of high-quality and/or sensitive habitats?</p> <p>Would the project provide essential habitat for larger conservation plans related to the SPFC?</p> <p>Does the Applicant describe how the project proposes to yield species and/or habitat mitigation credits for SPFC activities as part of an accepted IRT process or other suitable instrument, or to implement conservation actions in accordance or compatible with an NCCP?</p>	0, 3, 4, and 5	5 points will be awarded if a project would provide very substantial habitat improvements in terms of floodplain inundation and/or greater extent, quality , and diversity of riparian and wetland communities directly related to the SPFC. A score of 5 is reserved for projects that would be in close proximity or ideally contiguous to other high-quality conserved or natural areas, and that are expected to yield mitigation credits (or conservation activities as part of an NCCP) for SPFC facilities in the future.	7	35
		4 points will be awarded if a project would provide substantial habitat improvements in terms of floodplain inundation and/or greater extent, quality , and diversity of riparian and wetland communities on only part of the project's footprint. A score of 4 may be awarded for projects that would be in close proximity to other good quality conserved or natural areas (but not contiguous), and are expected to yield mitigation credits (or conservation activities as part of an NCCP) for SPFC facilities in the future.		28
		3 points will be awarded if a project would provide moderate habitat improvements in terms of floodplain inundation and/or greater extent, quality , and diversity of riparian and wetland communities related to the SPFC on only part of the project's footprint. A score of 3 may be awarded for projects that would be near (but not in close proximity to) other conserved or natural areas, and are expected to yield mitigation credits (or conservation activities as part of an NCCP) for SPFC facilities in the future.		21
		0 points will be awarded if the project would provide minimal habitat improvements, be located in isolated areas with little contribution to regional conservation goals, and/or is not expected to benefit SPFC facilities.		0

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Technical/Political Feasibility

Preference will be given to projects that will be ready to start in 2013, and to projects that demonstrate a high likelihood of achieving intended results before 2016.

Deleted: 2012 or

Criteria	Range of Possible Points	Scoring Standards	Weighting Factor	Possible Score
Project Schedule and Readiness Is the project part, or a continuation, of a larger regional conservation program or SPFC planning effort? Is the project broadly supported by different interest groups, agencies, landowners, and local officials? Have any necessary environmental documents been completed and/or permits been obtained, or are they in the process of being obtained?	0, 3, 4, and 5	5 points will be awarded if the project appears to be part of and/or complementary to regional planning efforts and is recognized as an important or priority area by other regional conservation or SPFC plans. A score of 5 will be reserved for projects that: (a) demonstrate consultation and coordination with the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) , as well as ongoing progress through the completion of environmental documents and receipt of necessary permits, such that it can begin implementation within the next two years; and (b) have an agreement in place for long-term management. A score of 5 will be reserved for projects that appear to have few or no constraints, title restrictions, or encumbrances , and virtually no opposition.	7	35
Are there restrictions or constraints at the site that could delay project implementation?		4 points will be awarded if the project is related to the SPFC, appears to be well planned and demonstrates ongoing progress, and is likely to achieve environmental values, but does not appear to be ready to begin implementation for more than two years. A project might receive a score of 4 if there are a few constraints that are currently being negotiated and are expected to be resolved prior to the awarding of a contract.		28
Is the project site free of title restrictions or encumbrances that might preclude its use as compensatory mitigation?		3 points will be awarded if the project appears to be well planned, but may not be ready to begin implementation for more than three years. An apparently well-planned project might receive a score of 3 if Key Cooperators are still being identified and therefore are not named in the concept proposal and/or there are several potential constraints.		21
		0 points will be awarded if the Applicant is unable to demonstrate that the project is feasible to begin implementation within the next five years, or there are significant constraints or active opposition.		0

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Cost Considerations

Preference will be given to projects that are expected to yield a comparatively high value of ecosystem services per bond dollar invested, and to projects that demonstrate significant in-kind service support and/or financial contributions from partners and others that are supportive of the project.

Deleted: good return on DWR

Deleted: funding investment over the long term relating to SPFC activities

Criteria	Range of Possible Points	Scoring Standards	Weighting Factor	Possible Score
<u>Reasonableness of Costs</u> Do the tasks and figures provided in the funding table seem to be justified and reasonable?	0, 3, 4, and 5	5 points may be awarded if the funding table seems to include all tasks necessary to implement the proposal, the figures provided in the table appear to be justified and reasonable, <u>and the proposal appears to yield the highest value of ecosystem services per bond dollar spent as compared to other proposals</u> . A score of 5 requires identification of potential in-kind service support and/or funding from partnering entities and others supportive of the project, as well as availability of funding for long-term maintenance <u>and monitoring</u> of the project.	4	20
<u>In-kind or Financial Contributions</u> Has the Applicant identified current or potential partners that may provide financial and/or in-kind service support for this project?		4 points will be awarded if the funding table seems to include all appropriate tasks necessary to implement the proposal, the figures provided in the table appear to be mostly justified and reasonable, <u>and the proposal appears to yield relatively high value of ecosystem services per bond dollar spent as compared to other proposals</u> . A score of 4 may be given when potential project partners and supporters can be identified, but potential in-kind service support and/or funding from those partners is not well described or it is unclear whether these matching funds would be used toward long-term maintenance <u>and monitoring</u> of the project.		16
<u>Long-term Maintenance and Monitoring Funding</u> Has the Applicant addressed the issue of long-term maintenance funding for the project by identifying potential funding sources?		3 points may be awarded if the funding table appears to be missing some essential tasks or if there are reasonable doubts by reviewers of whether some information provided in the table is justified and/or reasonable. A score of 3 may also be given if a few potential project partners can be identified, but their potential in-kind service support and/or funding is not described.		12
<u>IRT Considerations</u> <u>If the Applicant is proposing a project that will provide credits through an IRT approval process, does the Applicant appear to include all costs of a project typically required by the IRT bank templates?</u>		0 points will be awarded if the funding table is incomplete or missing many essential tasks, and/or if the information in the table doesn't appear to reviewers to be justified or reasonable.		0

Deleted: and if

Deleted: and if

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Extent of Flood Management Benefits

Preference is given to projects that demonstrate flood management benefits by providing mitigation for future SPFC activities and/or are expected to reduce long-term flood management costs at SPFC facilities.

Criteria	Range of Possible Points	Scoring Standards	Weighting Factor	Possible Score
Has the applicant identified how the project would provide significant mitigation or conservation value for SPFC activities? Is the project expected to reduce long-term flood management costs, including operations, maintenance, and repairs of SPFC facilities?	0, 3, 4, and 5	5 points will be awarded if the Applicant has demonstrated <u>how the project would obtain mitigation or conservation credit for future SPFC work</u> , and <u>reviewers are confident that a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the appropriate fish and wildlife regulatory agencies will be obtained</u> . A score of 5 will be reserved for projects that <u>demonstrate a high degree of certainty that they will</u> provide significant mitigation/conservation value for SPFC activities and/or are expected to substantially reduce long-term flood management costs for SPFC facilities.	2	10
		4 points will be awarded if the Applicant has demonstrated <u>how the project would obtain mitigation or conservation credit for future SPFC work</u> , and <u>reviewers are hopeful that a MOA with the appropriate fish and wildlife regulatory agencies will be obtained</u> . A score of 4 may be awarded for projects that are expected to provide mitigation/conservation value for SPFC activities and/or are likely to reduce long-term flood management costs for SPFC facilities.		8
		3 points will be awarded if the Applicant has <u>described how</u> the project <u>would obtain mitigation or conservation credit for future SPFC work</u> , but <u>reviewers are uncertain that a MOA with the appropriate fish and wildlife regulatory agencies will be obtained</u> . A score of 3 may be awarded for projects that might possibly provide some mitigation/conservation value for SPFC activities and/or reduce long-term flood management costs for SPFC facilities.		6
		0 points will be awarded if the Applicant has not <u>described how</u> the project <u>would obtain mitigation or conservation credit for future SPFC work</u> , or if <u>reviewers are doubtful that a MOA with the appropriate fish and wildlife regulatory agencies will be obtained</u> .		0

Deleted: consultation

Deleted: coordination

Deleted: Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB), including but not limited to the completion

Deleted: submittal of a Hydrologic & Hydraulic (H&H) analysis acceptable to the CVFPB, if applicable to the project, and has written verification of whether the project will require an encroachment permit from the CVFPB.

Deleted: consultation

Deleted: coordination

Deleted: CVFPB, including but not limited to the completion

Deleted: submittal of a H&H analysis acceptable to the CVFPB, if applicable to the project, and can assert whether the project requires an encroachment permit from the CVFPB

Deleted: demonstrated communication with the CVFPB, but may not have completed or submitted a H&H analysis acceptable to the CVFPB, if applicable to

Deleted: yet contacted the CVFPB and has not begun to analyze the hydrologic and hydraulic impacts of

Deleted: the project benefits seem minimal or non-existent

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Application Form for Full Proposals

The electronic version of the Application Form is available at <http://www.water.ca.gov/bms>. Once on the website, navigate to “Central Valley Flood System Conservation Framework and Strategy 2012” on the “Active PSPs” tab to complete and submit your application. Applicants should not submit a full proposal until they have submitted a concept proposal and have been invited by DWR to complete a full proposal on the BMS website.

Section 1: General Project Information

G1: Applicant Information	Provide the information requested in the “Applicant Information” section. If the Project Lead organization is a local government, nonprofit, or consortium, attach a resolution from the appropriate applicant organization authorizing the Applicant to sign a funding agreement on its behalf.
G2: Key Cooperators	Provide names, contact information, and resumes for any (sub)contractors, advisors, or other technical personnel identified as being necessary for successful completion of the project (“Key Cooperators”).
G3: Project Title	Give your project a short title.
G4: Project Location	List all the counties in which project activities would occur under this proposal. In addition, list all river systems, and approximate locations (in river miles, if applicable), on which project activities would occur under this proposal.
G5: Current Zoning and Land Use	Describe the current zoning and land use for the parcel(s) that are the subject of this proposal. If there is a likelihood of zoning or general plan changes for the property in the next year (e.g., a General Plan update is in process, or a zoning code amendment is or will soon be proposed), provide a brief explanation of the expected changes.
G6: Description of Parcel(s)	Give the size of the property (in acres) that is the subject of this proposal, and briefly describe the natural resources on the property currently.
G7: Landowner(s)	Identify all recorded legal rights on the property, including but not limited to ownership titles, easements, liens or other encumbrances for the property that is the subject of this proposal.
G8: Holder(s) of Water and Mineral Rights, and Rights of Way	Identify all legal holders of water and/or mineral rights for the property, and identify any existing Rights of Way (ROWs) and possible implications for land management. Check the box to verify that any water rights necessary to implement the project have been obtained, and indicate the basis of those rights.
G9: Landowner(s) Willingness to Participate	If the property is in private ownership, is there a legally binding agreement with the landowner that would allow habitat to be developed on the parcel? If so, check the box and attach a copy of the agreement. Also, if the property is in private ownership, is there an agreement

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

	with or written authorization from the owner that DWR or its multi-agency group can visit the site for reconnaissance level visits? If so, check the box and attach a copy of the agreement/authorization.
G10: Project Description	<p>Give a detailed description of the project and clearly indicate which portions are proposed for DWR's bond funding. The project description should include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the goals and objectives of the project;• the activities that will be undertaken under this proposal to achieve the project objectives;• the approximate timelines for deliverables associated with this proposal;• a brief description, including approximate timelines and expected deliverables, of any future phases that would result in full implementation of the project, if applicable. <p>Attach location maps, designs, color photographs, or other information that describes the project.</p>
G11: Habitat Connectivity	<p>If the property is located near any protected habitat areas or high-quality habitat types, describe these areas/habitat types and indicate their proximity (in linear miles) to the project site.</p> <p>Attach map(s) showing the location of nearby habitat and conserved areas.</p>
G12: Benefits to Sensitive Habitats and/or Species	<p>Describe any benefits that are expected to accrue to fish, wildlife, or plant species listed as threatened, endangered, of special concern, or otherwise protected by law, as well as any benefits to sensitive habitats on which these species depend, as a result of this project.</p>
G13: Project Support and/or Opposition	<p>Give a description of the outreach that has been conducted to date for this project.</p> <p>Give a characterization for the level of support for this project among nearby landowners and local interests, entities, and organizations.</p> <p>Give a characterization of any known opposition to the project.</p>
G14: Status of Permits and Documents	<p>Briefly describe the permits and environmental document that will be applicable to your project, and the status of obtaining those permits or preparing those documents.</p>
G15: Funding Requested	<p><i>Refer to the Excel spreadsheet budget sheet template.</i> Indicate within the budget sheet how much bond money is being requested from DWR (\$), and how much money or in-kind service (\$) is being provided by the Applicant, Key Cooperators, and other partnering entities. (If in-kind services or resources are being provided, estimate their monetary value.)</p>
G16: Estimates of Costs for Future Phases	<p>Several items, including mobilization, construction, monitoring, and land stewardship, will be necessary for the project to be fully implemented. DWR needs to know if the expectation of funds for future phases of the project exceeds the budget DWR has allocated to these projects.</p> <p><i>Refer to the Excel spreadsheet budget sheet template.</i> If this project is anticipated to have subsequent phases, indicate within the table the needs (activities and deliverables) and approximate costs (\$) of the future phases needed for the project to be fully implemented in the future.</p>

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

G17: Project Elements (See Section 1.1)	Check Advance Mitigation and /or Advance Conservation, and then proceed to answer the questions for the applicable element.
---	---

Deleted: either

Section 2: Specific Project Information – Advance Mitigation Element

Answer the questions in this section if your proposal is to provide exclusive (i.e. only to DWR) mitigation for the unavoidable impacts resulting from the evaluation, repair, reconstruction, or replacement of SPFC levees, weirs, bypasses, and facilities (Advance Mitigation Projects).

Advance Mitigation Projects can be proposed in accordance with the existing Interagency Review Team (IRT) mitigation banking process (answer the questions in 2.1.1), and/or through the development of other mechanisms, such as umbrella banks (answer the questions in 2.1.2).

Note regarding purchase of existing credits: The Department recognizes the value in purchasing existing mitigation credits and may seek bulk acquisition of credits for the SPFC in a future PSP or Request for Bids. For the purposes of this PSP, the Department will not be placing a priority on purchasing existing credits from mitigation banks.

Section 2.1. [Advance Mitigation Using Interagency Review Team \(IRT\) Process](#)

Deleted: 1

DWR is interested in creating mitigation banks with regulatory agencies participating on the Interagency Review Team (IRT) as the signatories, and to provide advance mitigation credits for sensitive habitats and species that are expected to be impacted by future SPFC projects, including but not limited to:

- Riparian forest and shrub-scrub (e.g., mitigation for implementation of Life Cycle Management)
- Shaded riverine aquatic (SRA) areas
- Channel margin and floodplain areas
- Salmon and steelhead; green sturgeon (mitigation for impacts to habitat from alterations to SPFC facilities)

Please refer to Table 1 for the list of species and natural communities targeted by this PSP.

AM1: Land Control (privately-owned lands)	Describe whether acquisition from willing sellers of private lands will be through fee title or conservation easement. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If acquisition will be through fee title, check the box and proceed to the next question (AM2).• If acquisition will be through conservation easement, check the appropriate box (Yes/No) to the following three questions:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Is there a legally binding agreement with the landowner that would allow habitat to be developed on the parcel?○ Is the conservation easement already recorded?○ Is the conservation easement under development? (If Yes, explain the status of the recording of the conservation easement, and provide an expected timeline.)
AM2: IRT Mitigation	Completion of specific activities (refer to the Mitigation Banking

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Banking Enabling Instrument Checklist	Enabling Instrument checklist currently utilized by the Interagency Review Team (IRT), provided as Attachment B1) is currently required by regulatory agencies for the establishment of a mitigation or conservation bank. For this PSP, DWR is soliciting proposals that will serve as 'advance mitigation' for SPFC facilities' evaluation, repair, reconstruction, or replacement projects; therefore, habitat and/or species credits at the bank site may be determined at a later date in light of future permit needs of the individual facilities (a situation sometimes referred to as a "turn-key" or "single-user" mitigation bank). Describe which specific component(s) of these IRT requirements are being proposed as part of this project.
AM3: Land Improvement (State or federal lands)	If the proposal is to establish a bank site on real property that is already under the control of a State or federal agency, describe which specific component(s) of the IRT requirements are being proposed as part of this project (refer to the Mitigation Banking Enabling Instrument checklist provided as Attachment B1).
AM4: DFG Mitigation Policy on Publicly Owned and Conserved Lands	If the proposal is to establish a bank site on real property that is already under the control of a State or federal agency and/or was acquired for conservation purposes, and if the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is one of the regulatory agencies that would be a signatory for the development and use of mitigation credits, please check the box to indicate that you have read and understand DFG's new policy for mitigation on publicly owned and conserved lands (included as Attachment B2).

Section 2.2. Advance Mitigation Using Umbrella Banks or Other Mechanisms

Deleted: 1.

In addition to the establishment of site-specific mitigation banks, described in the previous section, where credits are used or sold for specific projects until the credits have been depleted, DWR is considering formulation of "umbrella" mitigation banking instruments with the appropriate regulatory agencies. **An umbrella bank is merely an instrument that defines the requirements that must be met for a property within an established service area (as defined within the umbrella mitigation bank instrument) to be added as an amendment to the instrument in the future.** DWR personnel will initiate umbrella banking instruments with the appropriate regulatory agencies, to provide advance mitigation credits for sensitive habitats and species that are expected to be impacted by future SPFC projects, including but not limited to:

Deleted: ; the umbrella bank does not in and of itself provide certified mitigation credits.

- Riparian forest and shrub-scrub (e.g., mitigation for implementation of Life Cycle Management)
- Shaded riverine aquatic (SRA) areas
- Channel margin and floodplain areas
- Salmon and steelhead; green sturgeon (mitigation for impacts to habitat from alterations to SPFC facilities)

Please refer to Table 1 for the list of species and natural communities targeted by this PSP.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

AM5: Umbrella Bank Development (OPTIONAL)	Indicate whether you would like your proposal to be considered for inclusion under one or more umbrella mitigation banking instruments by checking any and all that apply to your project. <i>Note that funding for such a project or activity will be contingent upon approval by the relevant regulatory agencies that the project meets the mitigation requirements for inclusion in an umbrella mitigation bank in the future, including but not limited to long-term management and funding assurances.</i>
AM6: DFG Mitigation Policy on Publicly Owned and Conserved Lands	If you answered Question AM5 (Umbrella Bank Development) and your proposal is to establish an umbrella bank site on real property that is already under the control of a State or federal agency and/or was acquired for conservation purposes, and if the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is one of the regulatory agencies that would be a signatory for the development and use of mitigation credits, please check the box to indicate that you have read and understand DFG's new policy for mitigation on publicly owned and conserved lands (included as Attachment B2).
AM7: Other Proposed Mitigation Mechanisms (OPTIONAL)	If Applicants feel they cannot or may not need to meet IRT requirements described in Attachment B1, they are encouraged to identify potential alternatives that can provide equivalent information for consideration by applicable regulatory agencies outside of the IRT process. Describe those alternatives here. <i>Note that funding for such a project or activity will be contingent upon the relevant regulatory agencies' approval of these alternatives as functionally equivalent to the information required by the IRT, such that they can formally become a signatory for the development and use of mitigation credits in permit negotiations on SPFC projects.</i>

Section 3: Specific Project Information – Advance Conservation Element

Answer the questions in this section if your proposal is to implement conservation actions, as part of a comprehensive regional plan, which will improve the extent and/or condition of natural resources that will be impacted by the future evaluation, repair, reconstruction, or replacement of SPFC levees, weirs, bypasses, and facilities (Advance Conservation Projects).

Advance Conservation Projects can be proposed in accordance or compatible with approved Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) (answer the questions in 3.1.1), NCCPs that are still under development (answer the questions in 3.1.2), and/or through the development of a new NCCP specific to SPFC facilities (answer the questions in 3.1.3).

Section 3.1 Advance Conservation within an Approved NCCP

DWR is considering partnering with entities that are currently implementing an approved NCCP, to implement conservation actions which will improve the extent and/or condition of natural communities that will be impacted by the future evaluation, repair, reconstruction, or replacement of SPFC levees, weirs, bypasses, and facilities, and/or to attain incidental take coverage for species that inhabit these impacted natural communities. These natural communities include, but may not be limited to:

Deleted: .1

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

- Riparian forest and shrub-scrub
- Shaded riverine aquatic (SRA)
- Channel margin and floodplain

Please refer to Table 1 for the list of natural communities targeted by this PSP.

AC1: Name and Approval Date of NCCP	Identify by name the existing NCCP under which DWR's advance conservation activities could occur (or be compatible with), as well as the date the NCCP was formally approved by regulatory agencies.
AC2: Applicability to NCCP's Covered Activities	Identify the specific conservation measures or covered activities within the existing NCCP under which DWR's advance conservation activities could occur (or be compatible with). When NCCP documents are being used, please reference the specific page and sections of the document.
AC3: Role of DWR in NCCP Implementation	Identify the conditions under which DWR would be authorized to undertake advance conservation activities in accordance or compatible with this NCCP. Examples include, but may not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DWR must sign an amended implementation agreement• DWR must sign a sub-agreement to the implementation agreement• DWR must only provide funding and a "Certificate of Inclusion" will be provided.• A division of Credits between DWR and other NCCP signatories will be formalized through other agreements.
AC4: Adherence to HCP/NCCP Requirements	If the proposal is to work within the construct of an approved NCCP to undertake advance conservation activities, please check the box to indicate that you understand that the project would need to meet the NCCP's own biological goals and objectives, adaptive management, funding, and monitoring and reporting requirements.

Deleted: .1

Section 3.2 Advance Conservation within an NCCP under Development

DWR is considering partnering with entities and organizations that are in the process of developing an NCCP, to implement conservation actions which will improve the extent and/or condition of natural communities that will be impacted by the future evaluation, repair, reconstruction, or replacement of SPFC levees, weirs, bypasses, and facilities, and/or to attain incidental take coverage for species that inhabit these impacted natural communities. These natural communities include, but may not be limited to:

- Riparian forest and shrub-scrub
- Shaded riverine aquatic (SRA)
- Channel margin and floodplain

Please refer to the Table 1 for the list of natural communities targeted by this PSP.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

AC5: Name and Status of NCCP	Identify by name the NCCP that is under development, under which DWR's advance conservation activities could occur. Give a brief timeline of NCCP development to date, and the anticipated timeline for the NCCP's completion and approval.
AC6: Applicability to Covered Activities and/or Consideration of Adding New Covered Activities	Identify conservation measures or covered activities that have been discussed during the development of this NCCP, under which DWR's advance conservation activities could occur. Also, indicate whether the NCCP planning entities are open to expanding the scope of the NCCP under development, if applicable, so that it incorporates DWR's future projects at SPFC facilities as covered activities under the NCCP.
AC7: Role of DWR in future NCCP Implementation	Identify the conditions under which DWR would be authorized to undertake advance conservation activities in accordance or compatible with the NCCP that is under development. Examples include, but may not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DWR must sign an existing or amended planning agreement• DWR must sign an existing or future implementation agreement• DWR must sign a sub-agreement to the implementation agreement• DWR must only provide funding and a "Certificate of Inclusion" will be provided.

Section 3.3 Advance Conservation for a Future NCCP for State Plan of Flood Control Facilities

Deleted: .1

DWR is considering formulation of a NCCP for the Central Valley Flood System Conservation Strategy that is under development. DWR would be responsible for coordinating with all relevant regulatory and partnering agencies in the development of any agreements related to the NCCP.

Within this category of Advance Conservation Projects, DWR is soliciting proposals that will serve as 'advance conservation' for a future NCCP that would include the future evaluation, repair, reconstruction, or replacement of SPFC levees, weirs, bypasses, and facilities as covered activities. Such 'advance conservation' actions include improving the extent and/or condition of natural communities that will be impacted by future SPFC projects and activities, and/or attaining incidental take coverage for species that inhabit these impacted natural communities. These natural communities include, but may not be limited to:

- Riparian forest and shrub-scrub
- Shaded riverine aquatic (SRA)
- Channel margin and floodplain

Please refer to the Table 1 for the list of natural communities targeted by this PSP.

AC8: Possible Future HCP/NCCP for State Plan of Flood Control Facilities	Please describe how your project would improve the extent and/or condition of one or more of the following natural communities that would be expected to be included in a future HCP/NCCP for flood system improvements:
--	--

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Riparian forest and shrub-scrub• Shaded riverine aquatic (SRA)• Channel margin and floodplain• <i>(Other): Identify and describe improvements.</i>
--	---

Section 4: Attachments

The following checklist of required attachments is provided for the Applicant's reference. Please limit the cumulative number of pages in the attachments to 40 pages or less.

- Resolution authorizing the Applicant to enter into an agreement (Question G1)
- A resume for each identified Key Cooperator (Question G2)
- A copy of any agreement authorizing creation of habitat on a private parcel (Question G9)
- Written authorization to access the project site for reconnaissance purposes (Question G9)
- Location maps, designs, color photographs, or other information that describes the project (Question G9)
- A map showing locations of nearby conservation properties and projects in relation to the project site (Questions G10 and G11)
- Budget Sheet for Current Proposal (Question G15)
- Budget Sheet for Potential Future Phases (Question G16)

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Evaluation Criteria for Full Proposals

The following information constitutes the basis for how DWR and other entities represented on multi-agency review teams will evaluate the full proposals submitted on the Bond Management System (BMS) website for funding consideration, including all required attachments. **Please note that the following information provides direction on how reviewers will score proposals based primarily on evidence contained within the proposal, but intermediate points may ultimately be assigned based on discussion amongst reviewers and best collective professional determinations.**

As with the scoring for the concept proposals, the scoring for the full proposals is broken down into four categories. The maximum number of available points is 100, with weighting and scoring among the four categories as follows:

1. Ecological Benefits (up to 35 points);
2. Technical/Political Feasibility (including completeness of cost estimates and project schedule and readiness as well as consideration of the technical experience of the Applicant and any Key Cooperators) (up to 35 points);
3. Cost Considerations (including reasonableness of costs as well as amount of in-kind or monetary contributions from partnering entities and supporters) (up to 20 points); and
4. Extent of Flood Management Benefits (up to 10 points).

DWR reserves the right to reject any concept proposal that has a zero (0) score in any of these four categories.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Ecological Benefits

Preference will be given to projects that provide greater extent and diversity, higher quality, and improved connectivity of [habitat associated with](#) ecological improvements, while yielding mitigation or conservation credits (or both) for the future evaluation, construction, repair, reconstruction, improvement or replacement of levees, weirs, bypasses, and SPFC facilities.

Criteria	Range of Possible Points	Scoring Standards	Weighting Factor	Possible Score
Will the project provide substantial habitat improvements in terms of increased: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• area of historical floodplain subject to flooding?• frequency of floodplain activation flows? and/or• area of riparian, wetland, or floodplain habitat capable of supporting multiple sensitive species related to the SPFC? Is the project located in strategic locations that improve connectivity?	0, 3, 4, and 5	5 points will be awarded if a project will provide very substantial habitat improvements in terms of floodplain inundation and/or greater extent, quality , and diversity of riparian and wetland communities directly related to the SPFC. A score of 5 is reserved for projects that are in close proximity or ideally contiguous to other high-quality conserved or natural areas, and that are expected to yield mitigation credits (or conservation activities as part of an NCCP) for SPFC facilities in the future.	7	35
		4 points will be awarded if a project will provide substantial habitat improvements in terms of floodplain inundation and/or greater extent, quality , and diversity of riparian and wetland communities on only part of the project's footprint. A score of 4 may be awarded for projects that are in close proximity to other good quality conserved or natural areas (but not contiguous), but may not yield mitigation credits (or conservation activities as part of an NCCP) for SPFC facilities in the future.		28
		3 points will be awarded if a project will provide moderate habitat improvements in terms of floodplain inundation and/or greater extent, quality , and diversity of riparian and wetland communities related to the SPFC on only part of the project's footprint. A score of 3 may be awarded for projects that are near other conserved or natural areas, but may not yield mitigation credits (or conservation activities as part of an NCCP) for SPFC facilities in the future.		21
		0 points will be awarded if the project would provide minimal habitat improvements, be located in isolated areas with little contribution to regional conservation goals, and/or provide no direct benefit to SPFC facilities.		0
Would the project provide essential habitat for larger conservation plans?				
Is the project expected to yield species and/or habitat mitigation credits as part of an accepted IRT process or other suitable instrument , or to implement conservation actions in accordance or compatible with an NCCP?				

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Technical/Political Feasibility

Preference will be given to projects that will be ready to start in 2013, and to projects that demonstrate a high likelihood of achieving intended results before 2016.

Deleted: 2012 or

Criteria	Range of Possible Points	Scoring Standards	Weight Factor	Possible Score
<u>Project Schedule and Readiness</u> Is the project part, or a continuation, of a larger regional conservation program or SPFC planning effort? Is the project well planned, with measurable objectives and plans and appropriate agreements for long-term management and monitoring? Is the project broadly supported by different interest groups, agencies, landowners, and local officials? Have any necessary environmental documents been completed and/or permits been obtained, or are they in the process of being obtained? Are there restrictions or constraints at the site that could delay project implementation <u>or preclude its use as compensatory mitigation?</u> <u>Team Experience</u> Has the Applicant provided resumes for all Key Cooperators that fully document their education and experience?	0, 3, 4, and 5	5 points will be awarded if the applicant has demonstrated the near-term feasibility of the project through letters of support and demonstration of adequate technical experience of the team collaborating on the project. A score of 5 may also be given if the project is recognized as an important or priority area by other regional conservation or SPFC plans. A score of 5 will be reserved for projects that: (a) demonstrate <u>consultation and coordination with the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB), as well as</u> ongoing progress through the completion of environmental documents and receipt of necessary permits, such that it can begin implementation within the next two years; and (b) have an agreement in place for long-term management. A score of 5 will be reserved for projects that demonstrate strong team experience, and have few or no constraints and virtually no opposition. 4 points will be awarded if the project is related to the SPFC and appears to be well planned and demonstrates ongoing progress and is likely to achieve environmental values, but may not be ready for implementation for more than two years. A project might receive a score of 4 if either the funding or the party responsible for long-term management is currently being negotiated. A project might receive a score of 4 if team experience with any of the planning or implementation steps seems to be limited, and there are few constraints. 3 points will be awarded if the Applicant asserts the near-term feasibility of the project, but may not be ready for implementation for more than three years. A project might receive a score of 3 if Key Cooperators are still being identified and/or there are several potential constraints. 0 points will be awarded if the applicant is unable to demonstrate that the project is feasible to begin implementation within the next five years, or there are significant constraints or active opposition.	7	35
				28
				21
				0

Deleted: Weighting

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Cost Considerations

Preference will be given to projects that are expected to yield a comparatively high value of ecosystem services per bond dollar invested, and to projects that demonstrate significant in-kind service support and/or financial contributions from partners and others that are supportive of the project.

Deleted: good return on DWR bond funding investment over the long term

Criteria	Range of Possible Points	Scoring Standards	Weight Factor	Possible Score
<u>Reasonableness of Costs</u> Has the Applicant provided a complete budget sheet, with all necessary tasks included? Do the figures provided in the budget sheet appear to be justified and reasonable, based on common industry practices and market rates?	0, 3, 4, and 5	5 points may be awarded if the budget sheet incorporates all conceivable tasks necessary to implement the proposal, the figures provided in the budget sheet appear to be reasonable, and the <u>proposal appears to yield the highest value of ecosystem services per bond dollar spent as compared to other proposals</u> . A score of 5 also requires written commitments of all in-kind service support and/or funding from partnering entities and others supportive of the project, as well as written commitment(s) of long-term funding for project <u>maintenance and monitoring</u> .	4	20
<u>In-kind or Financial Contributions</u> Has the Applicant identified current or potential partners that will provide financial and/or in-kind service support for this project? <u>Are these commitments in writing?</u>		4 points will be awarded if the budget sheet incorporates all appropriate tasks necessary to implement the proposal, the figures provided in the budget sheet appear to be reasonable, and the <u>proposal appears to yield relatively high value of ecosystem services per bond dollar spent as compared to other proposals</u> . A score of 4 may be given when potential project partners and supporters can be identified, but in-kind service support and/or funding from those partners is not verified through submission of commitments in writing or it is unclear whether matching funds would be used toward long-term project <u>maintenance and monitoring</u> .		16
<u>Long-term Maintenance and Monitoring Funding:</u> Has the Applicant identified funding for long-term management and maintenance of the project? <u>IRT Considerations:</u> <u>If proposing provision of credits through an IRT approval process, does the Applicant appear to include all costs typically required by the IRT bank templates?</u>		3 points will be awarded if the budget sheet appears be missing some tasks or there are reasonable doubts by reviewers of whether information provided in the budget sheet <u>is</u> reasonable. A score of 3 may be given if a few potential project partners can be identified, but their in-kind service support and/or funding is not described. 0 points will be awarded if the budget sheet is incomplete and/or if the information in the budget sheet doesn't appear to reviewers to be justified or reasonable.		12
				0

Deleted: Weighting

Deleted: and if

Deleted: justified and

Deleted: management and

Deleted: and if

Deleted: justified and

Deleted: potential

Deleted: Has the Applicant provided all current financial and/or in-kind service commitments from project partners in writing?¶

Deleted: all claimed

Deleted: these

Deleted: management and

Deleted: essential

Deleted: if

Deleted: some

Deleted: are justified and/or

Deleted: potential

Deleted: or missing many essential tasks,

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Extent of Flood Management Benefits

Preference is given to projects that demonstrate flood management benefits by providing mitigation for future SPFC activities and/or are expected to reduce long-term flood management costs at SPFC facilities.

Criteria	Range of Possible Points	Scoring Standards	Weighting Factor	Possible Score
Has the applicant identified how the project would provide significant mitigation or conservation value for SPFC activities? Is the project expected to reduce long-term flood management costs, including operations, maintenance, and repairs of SPFC facilities?	0, 3, 4, and 5	5 points will be awarded if the Applicant has demonstrated <u>how the project would obtain mitigation or conservation credit for future SPFC work</u> , and <u>reviewers are confident that a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the appropriate fish and wildlife regulatory agencies will be obtained</u> . A score of 5 will be reserved for projects that <u>demonstrate a high degree of certainty that they will</u> provide significant mitigation/conservation value for SPFC activities and/or are expected to substantially reduce long-term flood management costs for SPFC facilities.	2	10
		4 points will be awarded if the Applicant has demonstrated <u>how the project would obtain mitigation or conservation credit for future SPFC work</u> , and <u>reviewers are hopeful that a MOA with the appropriate fish and wildlife regulatory agencies will be obtained</u> . A score of 4 may be awarded for projects that are expected to provide mitigation/conservation value for SPFC activities and/or are likely to reduce long-term flood management costs for SPFC facilities.		8
		3 points will be awarded if the Applicant has <u>described how</u> the project <u>would obtain mitigation or conservation credit for future SPFC work</u> , but <u>reviewers are uncertain that a MOA with the appropriate fish and wildlife regulatory agencies will be obtained</u> . A score of 3 may be awarded for projects that might possibly provide some mitigation/conservation value for SPFC activities and/or reduce long-term flood management costs for SPFC facilities.		6
		0 points will be awarded if the Applicant has not <u>described how</u> the project <u>would obtain mitigation or conservation credit for future SPFC work</u> , if <u>reviewers are doubtful that a MOA with the appropriate fish and wildlife regulatory agencies will be obtained</u> , or if the project benefits seem minimal or non-existent.		0

Deleted: consultation

Deleted: coordination

Deleted: Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB), including but not limited to the completion

Deleted: submittal of a Hydrologic & Hydraulic (H&H) analysis acceptable to the CVFPB, if applicable to the project, and has written verification of whether the project will require an encroachment permit from the CVFPB.

Deleted: consultation

Deleted: coordination

Deleted: CVFPB, including but not limited to the completion

Deleted: submittal of a H&H analysis acceptable to the CVFPB, if applicable to the project, and can assert whether the project requires an encroachment permit from the CVFPB

Deleted: demonstrated communication with the CVFPB, but may not have completed or submitted a H&H analysis acceptable to the CVFPB, if applicable to

Deleted: yet contacted the CVFPB and has not begun to analyze the hydrologic and hydraulic impacts of

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

“Applicant:” A government entity, private mitigation banker, nonprofit organization, an organization consisting of more than one applicant, or any other entity that is capable of providing the services described in this PSP, that is the principal party applying for funding.

“Bank Enabling Instrument” or “BEI:” The document that sets forth the agreement of the Interagency Review Team, a property owner, and the sponsor of a mitigation or conservation bank regarding the establishment, use, operation and maintenance of that bank.

“Board” or “CVFPB:” The Central Valley Flood Protection Board (formerly the Reclamation Board) or its successor.

“BMS:” The Department of Water Resources’ Bond Management System website, <http://www.water.ca.gov/bms>.

“Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP):” The plan to be developed by the Department in accordance with Cal. Water Code § 9612.

“Central Valley Flood System Conservation Framework” or “Conservation Framework:” Attachment 2 to the public draft 2012 CVFPP.

“Central Valley Flood System Conservation Strategy (CVFSCS)” or “Conservation Strategy:” A longer-term plan for integrating flood and conservation actions throughout California’s flood management system, which will replace the Conservation Framework as part of the CVFPP update in 2017.

“CNDDDB:” The California Natural Diversity Database maintained by DFG. <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/>

“CNPS:” The California Native Plant Society database. <http://cnps.site.aplus.net/cgi-bin/inv/inventory.cgi>

“Conservation:” The maintenance, enhancement, and restoration of populations, communities, and ecosystem functions to sustain the services, benefits, and values of public trust resources.

“Department” or “DWR:” The California Department of Water Resources.

“DFG:” The California Department of Fish and Game.

“Eligible Project Costs” or “Eligible Costs:” The reasonable and necessary actual costs associated with implementing a project, as described in Section 4 (page 11) of the Guidelines.

“FESSRO:” The Department of Water Resources’ FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

“Guidelines:” The Central Valley Flood System Conservation Framework and Strategy Funding Guidelines, approved February 23, 2012, which provide the general guidance for this PSP.

“Hydrologic and Hydraulic (H&H) analysis:” As required by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board within its jurisdiction, the use of base hydraulic models to assist in understanding how flood events are expected to migrate through the flood system; this analysis is usually required to assist in identifying potential changes in flood stage, at local and regional scales, resulting from implementation of a project.

“Interagency Review Team” or “IRT:” The interagency team that provides regulatory review, approval, and oversight of a mitigation or conservation bank (usually the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the California Department of Fish and Game).

“Key Cooperators:” Any (sub)contractors, advisors, or other technical personnel identified as being necessary for successful completion of a project.

“Life Cycle Management” or “LCM:” As defined in the 2012 CVFPP, the State’s approach to levee vegetation management, where levees with “legacy” vegetation will be managed to allow the existing trees and woody vegetation larger than 4” in diameter to live out their normal life cycles unless they pose an unacceptable threat, while maintaining visibility and accessibility for inspection, maintenance, and flood-fighting activities. Implementation of life-cycle management will result in the gradual loss of important terrestrial and upper waterside riparian habitat throughout the SPFC; however, the State’s approach includes the early establishment of riparian forest corridors that are expected to result in a net gain of this habitat.

“Mitigation:” In order of preference, the avoidance, minimization, and compensation for impacts to natural resources by replacing or providing substitute resources (i.e., compensatory mitigation), as required by regulatory agencies to offset the impacts of implementing a project.

“NCCP:” A Natural Community Conservation Plan, as defined in Chapter 10 (commencing with § 2800) of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code.

“PEIR:” The CVFPP’s Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Report.

“Project:” All planning, engineering, acquisition of real property interests, construction and related activities undertaken to implement a discrete action to be funded under this PSP.

“Right of Way” or “ROW:” The legal right, established by usage or grant, to pass along a specific route through property belonging to another; or a path or thoroughfare subject to such right.

“Service area:” The geographic area in which permitted impacts of projects can be compensated for (or mitigated) at a given mitigation or conservation bank site.

“Shaded Riverine Aquatic” or “SRA” area: The near-shore aquatic area occurring at the interface between a river or stream and adjacent woody habitat.

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1

Deleted: <sp>

“State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC):” The State and Federal flood management works, lands, programs, plans, conditions and mode of maintenance and operations of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project described in California Water Code § 8350, and of flood management projects in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River watersheds authorized pursuant to Article 2 (commencing with § 12648) of Chapter 2 of Part 6 of Division 6 of the Water Code for which the Board or the Department has provided the assurances of non-federal cooperation to the United States, which shall be updated by the Department and compiled into a single document entitled “The State Plan of Flood Control.” *See* Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 5096.805(j).

“SPFC Facilities:” The levees, weirs, channels and other features of the Federal and State authorized flood control facilities located in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River drainage basin for which the Board or the Department has given the assurances of non-federal cooperation to the United States required for the project, and those facilities identified in § 8361 of the Water Code. *See* Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 5096.805(e).

“Systemwide Planning Area” or “SPA:” Lands within the Central Valley subject to flooding under the current facilities and operation of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Flood Management System (California Water Code § 9611 and 9614 (d, e).

“Umbrella bank:” An instrument or agreement with the appropriate IRT agencies that establishes a service area and then defines the requirements that must be met for a property within that service to be added as an amendment to the instrument in the future. An umbrella bank [is a single instrument under which multiple compensation sites can be developed.](#)

Deleted: does not in and of itself provide certified mitigation credits. -

Deleted: DRAFT

Deleted: June 1